

of the American people. I have dwelt more emphatically on this topic, because I consider the right of secession as by far the most important of all the questions involved in the present controversy; and the attack on it as one of the most insidious, as well as dangerous blows, ever leveled at the rights of the States, all of whom are deeply interested in the issue, since those who are now the aggressors, may one day be placed in a position where it will be their only refuge from the uncontrolled despotism of a majority. With regard to the expediency of the State of South Carolina exercising this right of secession, either now or at any future period, it would, I conceive, be presumptuous in one so far removed from the scene of action to offer his opinion, or intrude his advice. In such a crisis, South Carolina must act for herself alone. I would only observe, that in taking a step so decisive as that of withdrawing from the Union, unanimity among her citizens, or something nearly approaching it, seems indispensable. It appears, however, that many distinguished men among you, whose reputation is national, whose opinions are entitled to great weight, and who have heretofore taken the lead in opposing the compromise, believe that the time for secession is not yet come; that the co-operation of at least a majority of the Southern States is absolutely necessary to the successful issue of such a measure; that it is best to wait for further injuries, or at least to see whether they will produce such co-operation. Those whose views coincide with the resolution, adopted by your Association, on the other hand, believe that immediate secession, or secession, after "waiting a reasonable time" for the co-operation of other States, is indispensable to the safety and honor of the State of South Carolina. Which of these parties will eventually predominate remains to be seen; and until that is decided, I shall content myself with asserting the right of secession, leaving the expediency of its exercise to be decided by the result. Should it be found that a very considerable minority is not only opposed, but will resist a resort to this remedy for their grievances, I conceive its immediate adoption would be hazardous in the extreme. But when great interests are at stake, much should be risked in their preservation. For myself, I will only say, that were I a citizen of South Carolina, or any other Southern State, I trust I should not be found among those who, after placing themselves in front of the battle, and leading their followers into a position whence they could not retreat without dishonor, retire from the field, only, it would seem, to see if the enemy would pursue them.

A few words more, Gentlemen, in order that I may not be misunderstood or misrepresented, and I will no longer trespass on your time or patience.

If I know myself, and the innermost feelings of my heart, I am a better friend to the Union than many of those who, while loudly professing their devotion, are steadily pursuing a course of policy that has already alienated a considerable portion of its citizens, and will assuredly bring about its dissolution. It is under the influence of this attachment, that I have lent my feeble aid in opposition to that policy. Neither force nor coercion can preserve a Union voluntarily formed on the basis of perfect equality; nor do I believe it possible to preserve or perpetuate this Confederation by any attempts to extend the powers of the General Government beyond the limits prescribed by the Constitution, strictly construed, agreeably to its letter and spirit. The first attempt to coerce any one of its members, will be the handwriting on the wall, predicting the speedy and certain fate of the Union. It is not to be presumed that great States, many of them equal in extent to powerful kingdoms, and inhabited by increasing millions of freemen, jealous of their rights, brave, high spirited, and energetic, can be held together except by a voluntary cohesion. This Confederation may be likened to the great system of the universe, and it is only, by the benign and gentle influence of attraction, that the bright stars of our constellation can be kept in their orbits. Those who attempt to crush or spur them, will, in the end, fare like the rash fool who aspired to direct the chariot of the sun.

I am, gentlemen, your obed't serv't,
J. K. PAULDING.
To F. D. Richardson, H. H. Raymond, W. H. Peronneau—Committee, &c. &c. Charleston, South Carolina.

CHERAW GAZETTE.

CHERAW:
Tuesday Morning, Sept. 23, 1851.

TICKET FOR THE SOUTHERN CONGRESS.

A. W. DOZIER, ESQ.
HON. J. B. WILSON.

Wilmington and Manchester Rail Road.

We are much gratified to learn that the iron for this entire road, has been purchased, for the bonds of the company, upon highly favorable terms. The work, we understand, is progressing steadily to its completion.

Cheraw Plank Road.

The survey of the above road, has been completed, and the road located. The Engineer has not completed his report, but we understand, the route is most favorable for this species of improvement. We learn from the board, that as soon as the Engineer's report is made, the work will be let, and pushed with vigor, to its completion.

Anson Plank Road.

We understand that upwards of \$100,000 of the stock of this road, was taken up to Friday evening last—enough to secure the charter, and complete the road, at least to Wadesborough. Most of the above stock was taken by citizens of Cheraw. What an the Anson capitalists be dreaming about? Such an opportunity for profitable investment of capital, will hardly occur again.

Correction.
We have received a letter from W. R. MERRILL, Esq., which we regret we cannot give entire, in which he denies that he is a secessionist, or that his knowledge, politics entered into the canvass for Major of the Lower Battalion, of Marlboro, He patriotically declares, that if South Carolina secedes, he will co-operate with her, and that if she submits, he will submit with her.

Our authority for the statement of the Bell, was such as we could not doubt, and the statement is confirmed by the evidence of others.

A Correction.

Our readers, no doubt, will feel very much surprised, that we have again permitted Dr. M. McLIN to appear in our columns; nor will that surprise be lessened, when they behold the unqualified, ungentlemanly and scurrilous style he has adopted. Injustice to our cause, and his painful and contemptible sneers, on former occasions, we thought we had tumbled him and his communications down over head into the street; but other considerations prevailed, and induced us to permit him again to point our columns with his filth.

In one of his articles, he has, since it was first published, inserted a paragraph in these words:

"The preceding, I learned to the Gazette Office, in time for the last week's paper, and urged its immediate insertion, on the score of justice, as a correction from the editor's own columns, of his own representation of my position. He promised, both on Saturday and Monday, that he would 'try' to get it in the paper; but it was not put in. Of the justice of allowing his statement, another week for circulation, the reader will judge. He must have expected some effect from the statement or he would not have made it."

This statement, as a whole is, strictly false and the inference to be drawn from it most maliciously wicked. It was not brought to the office in time for last week's paper, and this Dr. McLIN well knows. He came into the office with it on Saturday forenoon, when we at once told him it could not go in, as there was at that time but two columns space, and that there was then about five columns, including our reply to his article of the week before, of matter in the competitors hands, and that it, of which would have to be given. With this statement, the Doctor seemed satisfied, and was about taking his manuscript from the office, when we remarked that, he could let it remain till Monday, and if possible, it should go in, which he did. On Monday morning he came into the office, and insisted as a matter of right, that we should exclude other matter, to make room for his, to which we replied, as we had done on Saturday, adding that were it possible his article should appear.

Dr. McLIN having conducted a paper for many years, is utterly incapable for the unfair, unfeeling attempt at misrepresentation. He knew well that we permitted him privileges which he never permitted to any one while he conducted a paper. He knew, that we, on the 2nd of September, just, gave notice editorially, that "all lengthy communications must be received by, or before the middle of the week, or they would have to be given. He knew that on Saturday we had not seen his article, and was entirely ignorant of its purport, and that consequently we could have no such base motive for not giving it a place as he imputes to us.

In conclusion we repeat that Dr. McLIN well knew, that this statement had no foundation in truth, and was maliciously designed to make an impression not warranted by the facts.

But what claims had he upon our courtesy, or columns at all, after having abused our confidence, and sneered at our paper on two former occasions. We do not ask him this question, knowing as we do, that his bigotry intolerance and presumption, are so largely developed as to smother every other faculty of his soul.

The crowded state of our columns, precludes at present all further notice of these articles, but they will receive our attention next week, when we will belabor accounts and end the matter.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Our New York Correspondence.

NEW YORK, Sept. 11, 1851.

Editor of the Gazette:

Cuban news is dull today. There is some talk, among the "boys," of putting the thing through, now, at all hazards, for the purpose of provoking a war with England. In a "leader," in the London Times of August 21th, it is plainly and specifically declared, that, in the event of the annexation of Cuba to the United States, the British Lion and the American Eagle must have their last great combat, the prize to be the privilege, on the part of the winner to do as he pleases for all coming time. The Times betrays, through all its bluster, a consciousness that England can never hope for victory, in a contest with the United States; and that a war would be entered into, by the former, merely to gain an opportunity of gracefully yielding, by treaty, what would else be wrested from her by violence, by her young irresistible rival. We can annex Cuba, if we want it, and I think we do; without any fear that England interpose to prevent us. She will remonstrate for course; but what of that? Who cares for remonstrances now-a-days? For my part, I hope the report, that another expedition will shortly sail for Cuba, is correct; and that we shall soon hear of its successful disembarkation, closely followed by the complete rout of the Spanish forces, and the speedy annexation of the "Pearl of the Antilles" to the Model Republic. That's the way to say it. Perhaps you don't agree with me; if not, I am deuced sorry for it.

I was awake, nearly all last night, by continued alarms of fire. There was nothing to justify the supposition that the whole Ward was, or soon would be, wrapped in flames. I stuck to my bed, however determined to allow nothing to rouse me, short of the burning of the house next door to mine. On going out, this morning, I found that but one store, a few blocks off, had been burned. The "devoting elements," as the penny-liners say, had devoured not only the store, but everything in it, with the exception of one of Rice and Co's, "im-

proved Salamander Safes," which had just been brought out of the smouldering ruins, as I arrived on the spot. The "Salamander" blushed a fiery red on every side, as if ashamed of being thus publicly exposed; and when the croton was played upon it, to bring down its temperature somewhat, it hissed like a nest of black snakes. I can't understand how it is, but these "Salamanders" always come out of a fire safe, although often heated red hot, and sometimes to whiteness. There are two patents covering this wonderful production of yankee genius; one of which is called the "Wildcat patent," and the other is known as "Rich's improvement." It sticks me that the manufacture of these safes is a lucrative business, as they are shipped to all parts of the world, where commerce has penetrated, and fortunes are made.

I must compliment our New York Firemen, in this connection. I do not believe that there is another such bold, skillful, and generous body of Firemen in the world. Give them anything like a timely warning and fair play, and, under their treatment, a fire stands no more chance of rising to the dignity of a conflagration, than a man confined in Neluchadnezzar's furnace would of successfully manufacturing ice-cream. This may be considered a strong statement, by the conservative reader, but it is as true as "preaching."

FOURTH, the actor, has been getting into another broil. His adversary, this time, is one "BOB SICILIANI," the proprietor of a Broadway dram-shop frequented by well-dressed loafers. Both gentlemen were at the opera, at castle garden, when Mr. FORESTER commenced "making faces" at "BOB," whereupon "BOB," requested the tragedian to desist; adding that it made him nervous. The "great tragedian," however, instead of complying with "BOB's" reasonable request, immediately gave the conversation a genealogical turn in which he left it to be informed that, "BOB" was not one of the genus homo, as has been generally supposed; on the contrary, decidedly and by descent, one of the canine species. "BOB" could not, I must say, inter anything else, from the "great tragedian's" remarks, which included the unqualified assertion that "BOB's" mother was a fenah of this species, her "Papa" being a lineal male descendant.

"BOB," having more "science" than WILLS, immediately brought his requisition the lefteloid muscle; and, letting fly from the shoulder, planted his "corn-stalder" between the tragedian's eyes. A general fight would have followed, had not the unqualified "doctors" immediately inter-

Yours truly,
CHESTERFIELD.

[For the Gazette.]

Mr. Editor: The object of this brief communication, is to call the attention of our Planters to the subject of the Cotton Planters' Convention. This Convention, which will be composed of Delegates from every cotton growing State, is to be held at Mason Georgia, on the 27th of October next. Would it not be a desirable for our Planters to take the matter into consideration, and elect Delegates as the property (and I must add the necessity of such a convention) must be apparent. Its deliberations may result in accomplishing much good. The Georgia Agricultural Fair, will take place in the same week, which will add no little interest to the occasion.

MARLBORO.

[For the Gazette.]

Mr. Editor: In the positively the last communication of "Dr. M. McLIN," which appeared in your paper of the 9th inst., the following language occurs: "If Mr. Editor, it is your opinion and the opinion of the high-minded and chivalrous Carolinian, who came up behind a mask last week to assist you in your personal warfare," &c. "You and your assistant, had that I was a leader, or aspirer to be, in our ranks." "Why do not you and your correspondents try to answer the objections to secession, before the public, from Congress, BARNWELL, BELLEVILLE, BERRY and W. BERRY, Towns and other abolitionists of the character," &c. &c. Without taking to myself the very complimentary title conferred in the above extract, I must respectfully conclude that I am alluded to, because on looking over the number of your paper referred to, I find mine to be the only article, which your editorial which makes the most distant allusion to the matter in controversy between yourself and your indefatigable correspondent. It has not (I hope) come to this, that all persons are prohibited from writing upon the same subjects, upon which some leading men have seen fit to dissent; but would it be prudent of all its interest. "On what sort of meat has this our dear fellow that he has grown so large?" But Mr. Editor, when that article was written (had the Doctor's authority by supposing the "personal warfare" between you and us, and consequently my public assistance (if proffered at all) would have been too late, as much as the arrival of reinforcement to a General who had already covered his last foot. But I did not so intend it, in fact, I could not see that you was in the least danger, but supposed the victory already achieved, and there were no spirits that I might hope to shake. Now I will not deny that during the battle, I was somewhat disposed to give you the benefit of a few facts, "fixed" in my own memory, having some bearing upon the conduct of the "action" (in Cheraw) for Delegates to the Convention, [such as the fact that one of the managers was charged with having sworn the others to conduct the election "partially" ("for short" I suppose) the fact that the tickets upon the managers table were headed "Secession ticket" and "Union ticket"; the fact that one gentleman (and only one so far as I could learn) tore the cap from "Union ticket" before voting; the fact that one Secessionist who spoke of the matter in my hearing, positively declared that their candidates:

any of them were in favor of immediate secession, and asserted that they were misrepresented for electioneering purposes; the fact that after the polls were authoritatively declared closed and the bag in which the votes were deposited had been folded over for the purpose of sealing, which was not done only because the managers neglected to provide themselves with wafers, a "Union ticket" was admitted, and in consequence of this one of the managers refused to sign the returns, (and very properly refused), &c. &c.] But I refrained from doing so simply because I thought it indelicate for a third party to thrust himself between any two gentlemen engaged in a controversy concerning matters of fact solely. I am therefore surprised to find myself placed in the very position I was thus slunning, and placed there by one who ought to have understood the matter better.

As to my coming up "behind a mask" I must plead in justification, custom, necessity and the Doctor's example. The Doctor commenced this very correspondence with you over the signature, and "behind the mask" of "M. M.," true there are the initials of his name, but "M. M." stands for a good many other things besides "M. McLIN"—for instance—"Mixed Multitude," "Majority Manufacturer," "March Maneuvering," "Marvellous Management," "Marlboro Mantle" and "Mystery" one other striking example not connected with politics, but almost as pointed as "M. McLIN" itself, which I shall leave for his ingenuity to discover. I am greatly deceived if your readers have not seen him even more effectively masked than this.

For my own part I have no desire to see my name in print, yet when I get to be as clearly proved as "M. M." was, I may (I don't promise) follow his example again and in that way cast myself upon the sympathies of the people. I regard all that he says about "mask" as a mere taunt and have no idea of unmasking because I see no good which it is likely to effect. When a writer has more confidence in his talent for conducting a personal controversy than in his ability to discuss "principles and measures" it is quite important that he should know who his opponent is, but if measures (not men) is the game he seeks, what matters it who his antagonist may be? I have too much respect for the Doctor (to say nothing of myself) to engage in any controversy with him, because I am satisfied from his great desire to know his opponent, as well as from the general character of his articles, that it must be a personal one, and there are many weighty reasons which would under such circumstances prompt me to yield him an easy victory, rather than engage in a mere war of words. He may therefore if it suits his fancy, fire away I shall adhere to my resolution to say nothing more. "I do not give saffron et cetera" yet all should know the respect due to them. As the Doctor charges that you have an "assistant" perhaps he may bring one into the field for the purpose of holding yours at bay while he demolishes you through the columns of the "Patriot" or "Standard," if he will come unmasked no doubt, and make the effort to unmask your honorable correspondent whose only sin in this matter is the high crime of venturing to speak while "gentlemen of quality" were conversing and speaking upon the same subjects which had engaged the undivided attention of some great men. It was presumption perhaps but nothing more. Let the Doctor's assistant come, however, and try the edge of his "keen Damascus blade" which he doubt he has been "whetting" by the midnight lamp, and morning star, for long time. My motto is "Co-operation, but—no Submission!" and though "Stat magis numbus umbra" (even a little smattering of Latin, the force of example again) he shall receive a hearty welcome. By the way, what are the duties of a Doctor's assistant? Are they any thing like those of an "assistant surgeon?" if so I presume he will come "armed and equipped as the law directs" you know how that is said to be; but in this case I suppose he will merely hold the patient while the Doctor amputates a limb or two, they anticipate a victory and would be cruel to disappoint it. The Doctor denies that he is "the leader" of his party, still he is the "Primus inter pares" (bad examples are more apt to be followed than good) and it is fair, as well as charitable to presume that he is as reliable an exponent of the views of his party as any one of his peers would be. I will here repeat Mr. Editor that I had no idea that my former article could be construed as an interference in your disputes. It was written (as it seems) under a misapprehension, the printer made the Doctor to say that he was done with the subject, and I ventured to allude to the same matters merely to illustrate the position of parties in Cherawfield. I was deceived it seems, the Doctor was not done, well I acknowledge that one must dive "into the palpable obscure to find out his ungodly truth." But I have nothing to say to more than is necessary to self defense, I shall say myself for his "assistant."

Allow me an N. B. Fellow citizens! Let the so-called co-operationists wince and twist as they may, the time has come when as Carolinians we are called upon to say distinctly and unambiguously whether we prefer secession with its imagined evils or submission and slavery. Every mail brings the unpleasant intelligence that the co-operation of other States, as State's almost hopeless but while it brings us this intelligence we are shocked with the certain prospect of the co-operation of the people of the other Southern States, if we are not like our own "sold will be covered with volunteers" in the cause of the old Palmetto, the cause of Southern Rights.

We are often told for effect that "the people of the other States are as brave as we are," (and they are the men we will have by our side). But I do us the truth of the assertion, all history disproves it. The Revolution and the Mexican war disprove it. Cherokees, Contreras and Chepentepepe who had the tale which all our ancient battles have told, "Carolinians are the bravest among the brave!" And the present issue presents but another occasion to test the question. If we shrink from the trial, if we permit ourselves to be lulled to quiet by the idea that what others submit to we may also bear, if we bow down and lick the hand of a master, no matter how powerful, we then beg our pardon from history its brightest page, for the brows of the noble Carolinians who composed the Palmetto Regiment the green laurels which they won, and which was won at their own at such cost in Mexico. Live our dead Victim of glory, by pronouncing the fruits of the victories he died to achieve worth not one struggle, to preserve and prove ourselves not only ready, but fit to become the most object of states. But if we do our duty and leave the consequences to God, if we resolve never to assume the position of a conquered people, before we are first conquered, if we strike for our rights and for Liberty, we will ever be adapted to Carolina's glorious wreath.

Immediate Secession was never dreamed of by any party, until when the "Co-operationists" went to bed thinking of some beguiling scheme to frighten towards Secession, then 'twas they fell upon the plan of painting up upon us that new born idea. But Secession without Co-operation if it was to be so, is quite a different thing. And it is time we had no neutral, no non-commitals among us! Why can't men tell us plainly whether if co-operation fails, they are for Action or Submission? Fellow citizens! Descendants of brave and patriotic ancestors, chose now between bare Submission which all admit will work your utter ruin, or manly and stern resistance which though hazardous perhaps, may yet preserve your Honor, and secure your Rights. 'Tis not the part of honest men to leave this dangerous issue to your children, but as your forefathers were careful for your rights and interests, so be you for your descendants. If co-operation should be a failure, then the alternative is plain, Submission! Yes Submission! Slavery! Submission! or Separate Action! Assured of your intelligence, your patriotism, and your courage, I know the answer Chesterfield will give if doctors do not mislead her. Standing by the side of old Edgefield, Spartanburgh, Fairfield, and a host of other Districts, she will shout in defiance to her foes, "at all hazards" SEPARATE ACTION.

[For the Gazette.]
TO COL. Q. W. BUDLEY.

DEAR SIR: Anywhere before the people a candid date for seat in the Southern Congress, and it is all important, for the sake of the interests involved in the question at issue, as well as for the sake of preserving us from what is yet more to be dreaded than submission itself—intestine broils and heated personal contests, that we the citizens of South Carolina, should clearly understand our several positions, you will permit us to define what we honestly believe to be the distinctive tenets of the different parties in our State, and respectfully to inquire what now is your position in respect to them.

It is presumed that every good citizen of our State, while he claims for himself the right to examine and decide this question, is nevertheless so good a citizen as to subscribe to what he may believe to be the ultimate and deliberate judgment of his peers. How important is it, then, that in an emergency like the present, we have the open, candid and honest conviction of each individual mind, and how sincerely it is the duty of him who aspires, or is appointed to the leadership of party to rise above the dirty pool of partisan tactics, and adopt the unequivocal language of the patriot. We mean by this remark, we assure you, Dear Sir, to urge no imputation whatever against your patriotism. God forbid! but in all honesty we have been constrained to regard your position an equivocal one, and we would call upon you, in the name of patriotism, to declare your present sentiments.

We presume it will not be denied by you, that twelve or eighteen months ago, our people almost unanimously, were in favor of resisting the compromise measures of the last Congress. No other voice, as we know, had been heard either in our Legislative halls—or our press, or from the primary assemblies of our people. The few advocates of the compromise measure—Union and Standards men—in our State thus hid their diminutive heads and spoke not. Nay, then the South, the entire South, seemed to be ripe and ready for resistance, the word secession everywhere was spoken, as the "one only remedy." What, let us ask, Dear Sir, was then your position? We catch the echo of your own voice and reply—before my election to the Senate, I declared "that I would go as far as any man, in resistance," after my election "I denied that secession was our remedy and I advocated non-intercourse with the North as a most prudent remedy."

Well, now, with this individual sentiment of our State, and this your position, our Legislature met. In the Senate a bill was introduced and passed, calling a convention of the people. For what? We answer, to resist secession. Nobly thought for anything else. You did not believe in secession and, therefore, with Mr. FERRY, the only avowed Union man in the House, and five others in the Senate, you voted against this bill. It passed the Senate triumphantly, and went to the House and was there killed—why? Because it required a two-third vote to pass it, and this majority could not quite be had. Why did it fail to get a two-thirds vote, was it because the House was of opposed to secession? No, not at all. The members were nearly unanimous in favor of resistance. Many of them, however, then entertained bright hopes of co-operation, on the part of other Southern States, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, they believed, would unite with us, (they had expressed their determination to resist these measures "at every hazard and to the last extremity") and they looked to a Southern Congress, as a certain instrumentality to secure this co-operation. They were not lost in favor of actual resistance, then the separate State actionist, nor were they more desirous to secure co-operation than the party voting for the Convention bill. The chief and only difference then was this—they could not take the chances for co-operation. The co-operation resistance men opposed and defeated the Convention bill, because in their view, it was calculated to defeat co-operation. But they were resistance men, and believing that co-operation could be had they expected another bill—a bill to elect Delegates to a Southern Congress, and this by way of compromise with the friends of the first measure, they appended to it the Convention bill of the Senate, and thus was passed a compound bill, which looked to resistance through co-operation in the first place, and that failing, to resistance through Separate State Action. As one of your constituents, we thank you, Dear Sir, for your recorded vote, in favor of this bill. But, as our object is simply to place you "rectus in curia," upon this question, and that we may understand each other, I must say, just here, to propound this question—Did you vote for this compromise bill because, like Messrs. CASSETT, PUNSTON and others, desiring and inquiring for resistance, you believed it could and would be brought about by a Southern Congress, or did you vote for it because you believed your constituents to be in favor of resistance, and that this Southern Congress bill, though it might seem to look to resistance, would fail of its end, and have the effect ultimately to kill off the spirit of resistance, then ripe in our own State? We have seen in what different lights this Southern Congress measure was regarded by the two parties in our Legislature. Mr. PUNSTON believed, with the separate State action men, that the hope of co-operation was a humbug, but nevertheless, he has uniformly argued for it to the last session. Now, pray tell me,

Dear Sir, what motive influenced you to give this vote? We feel that we may ask this question more pertinently, as you yourself have thought proper, publicly to denounce this bill, (your own vote) as a fraud upon the people.

Here, then, in our Legislature, began the apparent strife among the true resistance men of our State, and each of these parties, actuated, no doubt, by the most patriotic considerations, began a strife to inculcate their peculiar views of policy. It was among the dangers foreseen, and decreed by the friends of the State, that the co-operation party would embrace, with its fold, all the opponents of separate State action—or secession—of every grade, from the genuine resistance man, down to the most abject Union man; and the sequel has proved, alas! too truly, that the unhallowed leaven has spread itself until, warmed up by a desire for mere party triumph, guided by partisan fury and forgetful of the great interests involved, many who, in the outset, were nothing but resistance men, are now the willing apologists of a fast consolidating Federal power.

Well sir, time has sped on, and now the co-operationists, who prayed for a Southern Congress, as a means of resistance, is despairing. Georgia, Alabama, and unkindest of all, Mississippi herself, the author of this hope, has declared in favor of acquiescence in the compromise measure, and only measures against which we have been warning. Then, what now is the question which South Carolina must decide for herself? Will it believe! oh, can it be believed, that the question is just as it has been stated by the Marion Convention, (the body putting your name before the people), a question between "Secession and a Southern Confedera-ty!" Do you not blush, Dear Sir, to go before an honest and intelligent constituency, upon such an issue? Further comment is unnecessary—with a feeling akin to nausea, we turn from it, and as co-operation, in resistance to the compromise measures cannot longer be anticipated by any one, we present you with the true and only issue—resistance or submission!

No sane man now believes that the Lord for Southern Congress will ever assemble. For months past, Mississippi alone, was expected to meet us, and she, alas! has "stumped" her foot and fallen in the clay of submission. What importance, then, can attach to the election, for which you are now a candidate? I confess, I can look at it as of no further importance, than to ascertain whether our people are for resistance or submission; and, as one of the good people, I most heartily desire that this question be distinctly put and settled upon this issue. If they are for resistance, therefore, let them say so, by voting for WILSON and DOZIER, if not, let them say so, by voting for DUNN and ZIMMERMAN, and "let there be peace between me and thee."

Then, my Dear Sir, as co-operation is dead, as you yourself can point to no signs of its coming, let us pray you to meet the question boldly and distinctly. We learn that the State action party are to give Gen. McCLINTON a dinner, at Bennettsville, on the 22nd of Sept., and that they have invited you and your colleague, Dr. Z., to a free and full discussion of this question. It is not proposed to introduce any resolutions or to fetter the people with any vote-taking, but simply to discuss the question in all its present aspect, and leave them free to vote, at the October election, for resistance or submission. Then, in this view, may they not demand of you, a candid avowal of your opinion, and will not your refusal involve a disregard of the claims of an honest and inquiring constituency? But you will tell us, perhaps, that your opinion have been already expressed, that you have already conferred with your people through a written circular; but we contend that since the day of its appearance, the times have sadly changed—that whereas, you then contended for co-operation—there is now no hope of co-operation—no little, indeed, that many of the co-operation resistance men have given up all other hope, and are becoming the true friends of separate State action. Among these we are happy to instance the coming over of two or three, whom you have delighted to speak of as competent to decide this and all other questions for our people—the Duke—and last, though not least, we hail him of Chesterfield—late a Delegate to the very Convention which put your name in nomination for the Southern Congress—whose "mind has become satisfied, by recent events, that co-operation is not to be had," and that "the only question is secession or submission."

As then, once again, the co-operation prop is fast giving way—is indeed gone—we may and do call upon you, in the name of the people, to declare publicly for "Secession or Submission."

We would, that the history of events, since your return from the Legislature, could allow us one solitary hope, that you can yet be with us. But in candor, we are constrained to anticipate no such favorable response. You have addressed to your constituency the most direct appeals to their fears and to their love of money—you have depicted to them the loveliness of their faces, all radiant with the smiles of contentment and plenty, you have congratulated them upon the happy evidences of peace and prosperity, everywhere around them—you have told them, that if they have been robbed of a just right, to possess California, and though it is had, there is now no chance to regain it—you have presented your own State as a very little imperceptible, now astride "her log," pushing away on this side the "raft," then shifting her position, and turning herself away on that—always noisy and doing nothing—in a word, you have done well nigh all, save to lend "this glorious Union"—you have called together your friends and neighbors, and under the name of co-operation you have pledged them to submission—in a resolution which could not get the sanction of the flag-bearer himself, of the co-operation party in the February election. Nay, more—you declared, upon being interrogated somewhat publicly (at Red-bluff) falling to get co-operation you would submit. Then, in the name of the people, and of all that is to be preserved to them by resistance, on the one hand—or to be lost by submission, on the other, we conjure you to place before them, the question at issue in its true light, and I abide the result of the people's decision.

Yours, &c., FAIRBANKS.

[For the Gazette.]

"MONSIEUR TONSON COME AGAIN."
Mr. POWELL: I promised, in my last, not to appear again, in your columns, for the reason then intimated; still, I do appear, because I am urged by some of my co-operation friends, to correct an erroneous impression, which they tell me, has actually been made, to some extent, by your representations in regard to my position on the resistance question, and which they further tell me, is doing